

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SEVEN

In re THOMAS A.,

a Person Coming Under the Juvenile
Court Law.

B254115

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. KJ38484)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

THOMAS A.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Geanene M. Yriarte, Judge. Affirmed.

Courtney M. Selan, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Police officers encountered a group of youths standing on a sidewalk near a parked truck. They observed Thomas A., then 17 years old, duck briefly behind the truck and then back away. Thomas seemed nervous when one of the officers approached him. Following a pat search of Thomas, the officer found a handgun underneath the truck near Thomas and detained him.

The People filed a petition pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 alleging that Thomas had committed the offense of unlawful possession of a firearm by a minor. (See Pen. Code, § 29610). Thomas denied the allegation.

At the conclusion of the jurisdiction hearing, the juvenile court found the allegation true, declared the offense a felony, and sustained the petition. The court declared Thomas a ward of the court and ordered him home on probation.

DISCUSSION

We appointed counsel to represent Thomas on appeal. After examining the record, counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues. On June 10, 2014 we advised Thomas he had 30 days to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. We have received no response.

We have examined the record and are satisfied Thomas's attorney on appeal has fully complied with the responsibilities of counsel and that there are no arguable issues. (See *Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 277-284 [120 S.Ct. 746, 145 L.Ed.2d 756]; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 118-119; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

DISPOSITION

The order is affirmed.

SEGAL, J.*

We concur:

PERLUSS, P. J.

ZELON, J.

* Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.